

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 have been presented for examination. By the Office Action dated 22 November 2004, Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10 and 11-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal (U.S. Patent 6,256,666, hereinafter Singhal) in view of Keeney et al. (U.S. Patent 6,748,471, hereinafter Keeney). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal and Keeney in view of Lomas et al (US Patent 6,424,424, hereinafter Lomas). Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal and Keeney in view of Carini et al (U.S. Patent 6,636,873, hereinafter Carini).

By this response, Claims 3-7, 9, 10, 14-16 remain unchanged and Claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 12 have been amended. Claim 13 has been deleted. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-12, 14-16 are therefore pending. Given the reasons set forth below, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully but strongly submits that Applicant's claimed invention is not unpatentable over Singhal and Keeney.

Applicant's amended claim 1 recites a method for applying information to an appliance via both a mobile device and a computer system, wherein the information is stored in a sub-computer system. In the mobile device, the information to be processed and the appliance to which the information is to be applied as instructions in the mobile device are designated. The instructions from the mobile device are transmitted via the Internet to the computer system (page 7, lines 22-23, fig.1). The computer system is polled by the sub-computer system via the Internet (fig.1) and a firewall and the information from the sub-computer system is transmitted to the computer system via the Internet (fig.1) due to the polling by the sub-computer system, if the instructions from the mobile device are present in the computer system. The information is converted to formatted information suitable for the appliance according to the instructions and transmitted from the computer system to the appliance via the Internet (page 8, lines 18-22, fig.1). The formatted information is applied to the appliance for processing according to the instructions.

Singhal discloses a system allowing a user of a mobile device to send instructions to a mobile access gateway to instruct the mobile access gateway to process email attachments. The mobile access gateway fetches an email with an attachment to be processed from an email server and processes the attachment according to the instructions, such as deleting the attachment or printing the attachment. The mobile access gateway is the gateway of a mobile access network allowing data transfers from and to mobile devices. In particular, it is not disclosed that the mobile device and the mobile access gateway communicate via the Internet. Further, it is not disclosed that the mobile access gateway and the email server or the mobile access gateway and an appliance, for example a printer, communicate via the Internet. In contrast, fig.1 of Singhal suggests that the components involved in communication are connected by local area networks (LANs). Fig.5 of Singhal suggests that the email server and the mobile access gateway are directly connected.

According to amended claim 1 of the present invention, the computer system communicates with the mobile device the sub-computer system and the appliance server via the Internet. Since today, the Internet almost covers the whole planet, at least all important places in the world, the present invention as specified by amended claim 1 allows great mobility. The central server may be located at any place and, since it can be accessed via the Internet, can provide the service to use appliances to a mobile user who can be located almost anywhere in the world. For a similar reason, since the sub-computer system is connected to the computer system via the Internet, the sub-computer system can be located anywhere on the world and the computer system can access the information stored on the sub-computer system. Further, the computer system can access an appliance which may be located almost anywhere, since the computer system and the appliance server communicate via the Internet. Therefore, a high degree of user-friendliness is achieved since the mobile user can be located anywhere in the world, access information which is stored anywhere in the world and provide it to an appliance which is located anywhere in the world. This can be achieved with one central server. In particular, it is not necessary to provide a mobile access gateway for each mobile access gateway and to store the information to be accessed in a specific email server, namely the one associated with the mobile access gateway.

Keeney discloses a method and a system for requesting and receiving print jobs over a communication network. In particular, it is disclosed that a spooling server is periodically polled by a printer polling device over a network which may comprise a firewall.

It makes only sense to use a firewall and a polling method in an open network, i.e., a network which is accessible by a lot of, possible hostile, users, like the Internet. Therefore, the skilled person would not combine the teachings of Keeney with Singhal, since, as explained above, Singhal does not use such an open network for communication. Therefore, the skilled person would decide that it is senseless and inefficient to implement a firewall or a polling method.

Even if the skilled person decides to implement a firewall and to use a polling method for communication between the email server and the mobile access gateway, the skilled person would still not have achieved the abovementioned advantages of the invention which result from the fact that communications are done via the Internet.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject matter of amended Claim 1 is not obvious with respect to what is disclosed by Singhal, even if combined with Keeney, and thus is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Singhal in view of Keeney.

For reasons analogous to the ones above, independent amended Claims 11 should also be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Singhal in view of Keeney.

Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-10, 12, 14-15 should also be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ismael in view of Keeney since they are dependent on amended Claim 1 and amended Claim 11, respectively.

Further, fig.1 has been amended such that the reference signs used in the specification are now correct. Accordingly, the reference signs used in the claims have been corrected.

In view of the discussions set forth herein, it is respectfully submitted that the grounds for the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12, 14-16 should be found to be in condition for allowance.

Date: February 08 , 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Wendell J. Jones
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 45,961
Telephone No.: (650) 857-7453

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Mail Stop 35
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400